



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

RD
SL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/423,544

11/12/99

MARTONI

L

32872/GM/CH

MODIANO & ASSOCIATI
VIA MERAVIGLI 16
20123 MILANO
ITALY

MMC2/1013

EXAMINER

LAM, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

AIR MAIL

2834

DATE MAILED:

10/13/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/423,544

Applicant(s)

Marioni

Examiner

Thanh Lam

Group Art Unit

2834



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 24-46 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 24-46 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☒ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 24-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 24 recites the limitation "the rotor" in line 1, the limitation "the rotation axis" in line 6, the limitation "the motion transmission system" in line 7, the limitation "the preceding one" in line 9-10, the limitation "the angle" in line 10, the limitation "the intermediate components" in line 11, the limitation "a driven element" in line 12, the limitation "a driving element" in line 12, the limitation "a preceding one" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2834

4. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

For example: in claim 24 the limitation "one driving element" in line 5 and the limitation "one driven element" in line 8, are they related with the limitations "a driven element " and "a driven element" in line 12.

The phrase "the angle covered by the elements" is not clearly described how the angle is formed.

The limitation "a round angle" is not clearly described how the angle is formed.

The above are but a few specific examples of indefinite and functional or operational language used throughout this claim, and are only intended to illustrate the extensive revision required to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The above mentioned corrections therefore, are in no way a complete and thorough listing of every indefinite and functional or operational language used throughout this claim. Applicant is required to revise all of the claim completely, and not just correct the indefinite and functional or operational languages mentioned.

No rejection based on prior art is given at this point of prosecution. MPEP 2173.06 states:

"...where there is a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of a claim, it would not be proper to reject such a claim

Art Unit: 2834

on the basis of prior art. As stated in In re Steele , 305 F.2d 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962), a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should not be based on considerable speculation about the meaning of terms employed in a claim or assumptions that must be made as to the scope of the claims. ”

Given the great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of claims, it would not be proper to reject claims 24-46 on the basis of prior art. Given the 35 USC 112 deficiencies set forth above, no rejection based on the prior art.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Lam whose telephone number is (703) 308-7626. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0656.



Thanh Lam

Oct. 12, 2000



ELVIN ENAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AU 2834
10/13/2000